

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12, and 14 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kawasaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,463,276, herein "Kawasaki"); Claims 1, 2, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Lee (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030146699); Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Lee and Arimoto (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,674,061); Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawasaki and Arimoto; and Claims 3-6 and 16 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, in view of the amendments to the independent claims, dependent Claims 3-6 and 16 are maintained in dependent form.

In response to the outstanding rejections based either on Kawasaki or a combination of references including Kawasaki, independent Claims 1, 12, and 14 have been similarly amended to clarify relationships between (i) at least two first fluorescent layers and at least two first electrodes, and between (ii) at least two second fluorescent layers and at least two second electrodes. The claim amendments find support in Figure 1 and its corresponding description in the specification. No new matter has been added.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to a discharge light-emitting device that includes, *inter alia*, a transparent first substrate, at least two first electrodes formed on the first substrate, a transparent second substrate, at least two second electrodes

formed on the second substrate, at least two first fluorescent layers formed on the first substrate to be opposite to the at least first two electrodes relative to the first substrate, and at least two second fluorescent layers formed on the second substrate to correspond to the at least two second electrodes.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 1 shows the first transparent substrate 22, the at least two first electrodes 26a and 26b, the transparent second substrate 23, the at least two second electrodes 28a and 28b, the at least two first fluorescent layers 30a and 30b, and the at least two second fluorescent layers 31a and 31b.

Turning to the applied art, Kawasaki shows in Figure 11 that first electrodes 322 and first fluorescent layers 323 are formed on the same side of a first substrate 304, which is contrary to amended Claims 1, 12, and 14, which recite that the two first fluorescent layers are opposite to the two first electrodes relative to the first substrate.

Lee and Arimoto have been considered but neither of these references teaches nor suggests the features lacking in Kawasaki as discussed above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 12, and 14 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Kawasaki, Lee, and Arimoto, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Limited Recognition No. L0037

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK:RFF\la

I:\ATTY\RFF\24S\246194\246194US-AM-FEB7.DOC